

## Mental Health Funding & Policy Committee Meeting Minutes

February 18, 2009

## 1500 Capitol Avenue, Training Room A Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 445-8749

Attendants: Larry Poaster, Tom Greene, Rusty Selix, Patricia Ryan, Stephanie Welch, Wayne Clark, Richard Van Horn, Dede Ranahan, Mark Heilman, Ann Arneil-Py, Kirsten Barlon, Stacey Hiramoto, Janet King, Beatrice Lee, Delphine Brody, Teresa Pasquini, Annis Pereyra, Carol Hood, Rose King, Susan McCrea, Allison Homewood, Laurel Benhamida, Sheri Whitt, Beverly Whitcomb, Filomena Yeroshek, Matt Lieberman, Vivian Lee, Monika Grass, Luis Rodriguez, Janna Lowder (staff)

Agenda Item	Discussion/	Action	Individual Responsible
I. Welcome / Introductions	<ul> <li>Both Co-Chairs extended a warm welcome to all attendees.</li> <li>Introductions occurred for all the meeting participants.</li> </ul>		> Tom Greene, Larry Poaster
II. Review and Approval of January Meeting Minutes	<ul> <li>Richard Van Horn motioned for the minutes to be approved and Dede Ranahan seconded the motion.</li> <li>Minutes from the January Committee Meeting were approved.</li> </ul>	>	<ul> <li>Richard         Van Horn,         Dede         Ranahan</li> <li>Tom         Greene</li> </ul>
III. Financial Framework	<ul> <li>Brief description of what the Commission will be expecting in the financial framework report.</li> <li>Items to be included in the framework:         <ul> <li>Revenues (current &amp; projected)</li> <li>The Big Four Funding Sources</li> <li>Dollars Committed</li> <li>Dollars transferred from the State to Counties</li> <li>Dollars expended at the local level</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		> Tom Greene

1		
	Discussion on the February	> Committee
	Commission meeting presentation.	Discussion
	This presentation will include a	
	description of what the Commission	
	should expect to see in the completed	
	template, where the information will	
	be attained from, and how frequently	
	the information will be updated.	
	Discussion on correctly defining all	
	the items included within the	
	framework (i.e., Planning Estimate,	
	Commitment, Approved Plan, etc.)	
	Discussion about the necessity of	
	knowing how the dollars are being	
	used at the county level.	
		> Teresa
	The number of individuals being served by an FSP, what an FSP is	<ul><li>Teresa</li><li>Pasquini</li></ul>
	•	rasquiii
	really doing, and what is being spent	
	on all programs by each county is	
	information which should be	
	available to the public.	
	Discussion on the accountability of	> Committee
	counties and what is currently being	Discussion
	reported.	
	- Counties report on their	
	expenditures to DMH.	
	- The 09/10 annual	
	update should include	
	the number of	
	individuals being	
	served.	
	- Some counties post the	
	numbers being served	
	to their websites.	
	The information that the department	> Committee
	has includes: detailed planning	Discussion
	estimates, by component, by year,	
	detailed information on FSPs, and the	
	revenue and expenditure report.	
	FY 08/09:	
	- \$3.3 billion in planning	
	estimates	
	- \$1.9 billion in approved	
	plans	
	- \$1.4 billion not yet	
	approved or not yet	
	submitted for approval	
	<ul> <li>Discussion on the cost reports</li> <li>Identify the</li> </ul>	
	submitted to DMH. information	
	within the	
	reports an	d
	report bac	k to
	the Comm	
	Discussion on the Statewide	> Committee
	databases, county reporting and	Discussion
	availability of this data.	
	arandonity of time data.	

	<ul> <li>At the macro-level, desired information for a financial framework:         <ul> <li>The dollars coming into the MHSA fund</li> <li>Dollars in the planning estimates</li> <li>Dollars given to counties</li> <li>Reversion dollars</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	A	Larry Poaster
	A subgroup could be developed to look at this issue of what data is available, then bring this information to the Committee.	>	Pat Ryan
	Included in this work group could be Rusty Selix, Ann Arneil-Py, Pat Ryan, a MHSA coordinator and a DMH representative with an accounting background.	>	Rusty Selix
	> MHSOAC Staff, DMH and consultants could possibly collect all necessary information prior to the formation of a work group. Staff would need to work with DMH to identify what is being collected, what are the required reports and have examples of each report.	<b>A</b>	Tom Greene
	<ul> <li>Continued discussion on the workgroup and who would participate. Suggested participants were Ann Arneil-Py, Rusty Selix, Don Kingdon, Stacey Hiramoto, Dede Ranahan and Marti Johnson.</li> <li>Discussion on the amount of reporting currently being done by counties and clarification that the gathering of the discussed data will not put additional demands on</li> </ul>	A	Committee Discussion
	counties.  > Suggested that this discussion can be continued at the Communications Roundtable which is in the process of being rescheduled.  > Time for public comment was provided. Multiple individuals commented on the importance of tracking how counties are utilizing the MHSA funds, the importance of providing the public with up-to-date information, etc.	>	Public Comment
IV. Stakeholder Presentation	> Stacie Hiramoto handed out a REMHDCO policy statement and	>	Stacie Hiramoto

- REMHDCO	discussed who REMHDCO is and REMHDCO's position on flexibility and the multi tiered system.	
- Center for Reducing Health Disparities (CRHD)	<ul> <li>Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola handed out copies of a PowerPoint and discussed the recommendations regarding disparities.</li> </ul>	<ul><li>Sergio</li><li>Aguilar-</li><li>Gaxiola</li></ul>
- Cultural Brokers	<ul> <li>Janet King, with Native American         Health Center, provided the         Committee with a history on how the         Cultural Brokers was formed in         collaboration with DMH.         Recommendations were provided         which included, cultural brokers         being a part of every decision making         body and that cultural brokers should         be used as consultants and advocates.</li> </ul>	> Janet King
	Beatrice Lee, with California Community Health for Asian Americans (CCHAA), provided a description of the work which completed over the past year and presented on the continuum of care.	> Beatrice Lee
	<ul> <li>Time for Public Comment was provided. Multiple individuals, on the phone and in person, presented their comments to the Committee.</li> <li>Topics discussed varied from flexibility, the multi-tiered system, participation in committees, etc.</li> </ul>	> Public comment
V. Policy Recommendations	<ul> <li>Discussion on FAQs and what progress has been made.</li> <li>CMHDA has compiled some of the basic questions that they would like DMH to address within the FAQs.         These were sent to DMH on 2/17/09 as suggestions. A description of these questions was provided.     </li> <li>Discussion on flexibility and the requirement to still comply with the core values of the MHSA.         <ul> <li>All MHSA funded programs must be able to deliver MHSA services.</li> <li>Lack of the FAQs/clarification may lead counties to layoff professional staff to create savings.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Committee         Discussion</li> <li>Stephanie         Welch</li> <li>Committee         Discussion</li> </ul>
	Completed FAQs do not need to go through the Commission approval	

	process. Once DMH has completed the FAQs, they'll be posted. Discussion on the Federal Stimulus package and its impact on California. Discussion on the March Commissioner Strategic Planning Meeting. Discussion on the diversion of funds, the ballot initiative, and the impact of possible legislation.	
VI. Adjournment	possioio iogisianon.	